



CONTRIBUTION OF NICHOLAS HENRY IN ANALYZING THE DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AS A DISCIPLINE

Dr. Bharat Gore

Asso. Professor & Head, Dept of Public Administration, Vivekanand College, Aurangabad (MS)

ABSTRACT

Due to its latest origin and too much interdisciplinary nature as well its existence as a practice, the consecutive growth of the discipline of Public Administration is very difficult to organize without any heated discussion. Traditionally Political Science has been regarded as the “mother discipline” of Public Administration while the discipline of Management has been regarded as the “counterpart” of Public Administration. For most period of its evolution, this discipline has been fluctuating between the realms of Political Science and Management. It has only been since 1970s that Public Administration has been regarded quite distinct from these two disciplines. In such position, Nicholas Henry's studied narration regarding the evolution of the subject is very useful and farsighted.

KEY WORDS: Governance, Administration, Discipline, Locus & Focus, Paradigm.

INTRODUCTION:

As a field of systematic and scientific study, Public Administration is a modern discipline. Woodrow Wilson's essay entitled 'The Study of Administration' marks the beginning of systematic investigation into the field of public administration. Since then the study of the subject has passed through various phases. Each phase characterized by a particular paradigmatic approach. As observed by Golembiewski, the paradigms of public administration may be characterized and understood in terms of their locus and focus. Locus is the institutional 'Where' of the field and Focus is the specialized 'What' of the field. Nicholas Henry, in his famous article "Paradigms of Public Administration" (Public Administration Review, Vol.35, No.04, July-August 1975) discussed self-identity and the changing dynamics of that identity. As he mentioned in his article-It is my purpose in this article to: (1) sketch the development of the field by describing four broad paradigms of American public administration, (2) speculate on what the emerging paradigm of public administration may turn out to be, and (3) attempt to justify why it is mandatory that public administration "come into its own" as an identifiable, unique, and institutionally independent field of instruction, research, and practice.

In his article, Nicholas Henry sketched paradigms of public administration as below.

Paradigm 1: The Politics/ Administration Dichotomy, 1900-1926:

The emphasis of Paradigm 1 was on locus- where public administration should be. In Politics and Administration (1900), Frank J. Goodnow contended that there were two distinct functions of government... Politics and Administration. Politics has to do with policies or expression of the state will and Administration has to do with the execution of these policies. Separation of powers provided the basis of the distinction; the legislative branch, aided by the interpretive abilities of the judicial branch, expresses the will of the state and form the policy, while the executive branch administer these policies impartially and non politically. In the views of Goodnow and his fellow public administrationists, clearly, public administration should centre in government's bureaucracy.

Public administration began picking up academic legitimacy in the 1920s; notable in this regard was the publication of L.D. White's Introduction to the Study of Public Administration in 1926, the first textbook devoted totally to the field. It makes expect that politics should not intrude on administration. Management lends itself to scientific study; public administration is capable of becoming a 'value-free' science in its own right.

The net result of this locus oriented Paradigm 1 was to strengthen the notion of a distinct politics/administration dichotomy by relating it to a corresponding value/fact dichotomy. Thus, everything that public administrationists scrutinized in the executive branch was imbued with the colorings and legitimacy of being somehow "factual" and "scientific," while the study of public policy making and related matters was left to the political scientists.

Paradigm 2: The Principles of Administration.1927-1937

During this stage, the scholars believed that there are certain scientific principles of administration, which if, discovered and applied efficiency and economy of the public administration would be increased. Administrators would be expert in their work if they learned how to apply these principles. This paradigm began with the publication of W.F. Willoughby's Principles of Public Administration in 1927. It was second full-fledged text in this field. Nicholas Henry mentioned that public administrationists were in high demand during the 1930s and early 1940s

for their managerial knowledge, courted by industry and government alike. The focus of the field-its essential expertise in the form of administrative principles-waxed, while no one thought too seriously about its locus.

This 'high noon of orthodoxy' stage reached its zenith with the appearance of Gulick and Urwick's Papers on the Science of Administration (1937). Principles were important to Gulick and Urwick, but where those principles were applied was not; focus was favored over locus, and no bones were made about it. As rightly observed by Mohit Bhattacharya, "The 'public' aspect of public administration was virtually dropped at this stage and the focus was almost wholly on efficiency. This stage can be called the stage of orthodoxy, as efforts were underway to delineate firmly the boundaries of a new discipline of 'management'. Public administration merged into the new science."

The Challenge, 1938-1950

In 1938, Chester I. Barnard's The Functions of the Executive appeared. Its impact on public administration was not overwhelming at the time, but it later had considerable influence on Herbert A. Simon when he was writing his devastating critique of the field, Administrative Behavior. At this stage, public administration took two mutually reinforcing directions. It was argued that politics and administration could never be separated and the other was that the principles of administration were logically inconsistent. In other words, politics-administration dichotomy was rejected and the principles of administration were challenged and criticized on the ground that it was without scientific validity and universal relevancy. John M. Gaus stated succinctly, 'A theory of public administration means in our time a theory of politics also'. Then a spate of articles and books by Robert Dahl, Simon, Waldo, and others stated that there could be no such things as a "principle" of administration. Simon effectively demonstrated that for every "principle" of administration advocated in the literature there was a counter principle.

By mid-century, the two defining pillars of public administration- the politics-administration dichotomy and the principles of administration had been toppled and abandoned by creative intellects in the field. This abandonment left public administration bereft of a distinct epistemological identity. Some would argue that an identity has yet to be found.

The Reaction to the Challenge, 1947-1950

In the same year, that Simon razed the traditional foundation of public administration in Administrative Behavior, he offered an alternative to the old paradigm in a little noted essay entitled "A Comment on 'The Science of Public Administration'". For Simon, a new paradigm for public administration meant that there ought to be two kinds of public administrationists working in harmony and reciprocal intellectual stimulation: those scholars concerned with developing "a pure science of administration" based on "a thorough grounding in social psychology," and a larger group concerned with "prescribing for public policy," and which would resurrect the then unshiny field of political economy. Simon considers these two components mutually reinforcing and expect that it should go on side by side, for they in no way conflict or contradict each other. Simon's call for a "pure science" was not been welcomed by the scholars in public administration and political science alike. First, Simon's urging that social psychology provided the basis for understanding administrative behavior struck many public administrationists foreign and discomfiting; most of them had no training in social psychology. Second, since science was perceived as being "value-free," it followed that a "a science of administration" logically would ban public administrationists what from many of them perceived as their richest source of

inquiry: normative political theory, the concept of the public interest, and the entire spectrum of human values. In sum, then, public administrationist faced the worrisome prospect of retooling only to become a technically oriented "pure science" that might lose touch with political and social realities in an effort to cultivate an engineering mentality for public administration. There was also a more rationale for scholars in public administration to retain their linkage with political science; i.e., the logical conceptual connection between public administration and political science: that is, the public policy making process. Public administration considered the "black box" of that process. Hence, there was a carrot as well as stick inducing public administrationists to stay within the homey confines of the mother discipline.

At the same time, political scientists had begun to resist the growing independence of public administrationists and advocate the continuing domination of political science over public administration. By the post World War II era, political scientists could ill afford the breakaway of the subfield which still provided their greatest drawing card for student enrollment and government grants. As already shaken by "behavioral revolution" political scientist came to know that after public administration other subfields also were restive to withdraw membership of mother discipline. Moreover, in terms of science and social science both, it was increasingly evident that scholars in other fields held political science in low esteem and considered it to be the distinctly junior member of the social sciences.

Paradigm 3: Public Administration as Political Science, 1950-1970

In any event, as a result of these concerns public administrationists remained in political science department. The result was the renewed definition of locus- the governmental bureaucracy- but a corresponding loss of focus. Due to this, question regarding discipline's analytical focus, its essential 'expertise', was raised. The writings on public administration in the 1950s considered the field as an 'emphasis,' an 'area of interest' or even as a 'synonym' of political science. Public administration, as an identifiable field of study, started downhill. This third phase was largely an exercise in reestablishing the linkage between public administration and political science.

Things got relatively nasty by the end of the decade and, for that matter, well into the 1960s. Writing, research, remarks, and reputation about public administration started signaling a decline of faculty interest in general. At this stage, public administration was not welcomed by any reputed political science association or committee or any academic survey as a sub field or an emerging discipline. Waldo wrote in 1968 that, "The truth is that the attitude of political scientists.... is at best one of indifference and is often one of undisguised contempt or hostility. We are now hardly welcome in the house of our youth."

Paradigm 4: Public Administration as Administrative Science, 1956-1970

Partly because of the "undisguised contempt" being displayed in a number of political science departments, some public administrationists began searching for an alternative. Although Paradigm 4 occurred roughly concurrently with Paradigm 3 in time and never has received the broadly based favor that political science has garnered from public administrationists as a paradigm (although its appeal is growing), the administrative science option (a phrase inclusive of organization theory and management science) nonetheless is a viable alternative for a significant number of scholars in public administration. But in both the political science and administrative science paradigm, the essential thrust was one of public administration losing its identity and its uniqueness within the confines of some "larger" concept. As a paradigm, administrative science provides a focus but not a locus. It offers techniques that require expertise and specialization, but in what institutional setting that expertise should be applied is undefined. As in Paradigm 2, administration is administration wherever it is found; focus is favored over locus.

As a paradigm, administrative science cannot comprehend the supralvalue of the public interest. As concept, 'the public interest' and 'public affairs' terms tend implicitly to ignore institutional arrangements and concentrate instead on highly normative issues as they relate to the polity. Now without a sense of the public interest, administrative science can be used for any purpose, no matter how antithetical to democratic values that purpose may be. The concept of determining and implementing the public interest constitutes a defining pillar of public administration and a locus of the field that receives little if any attention within the context of administrative science, just as the focus of organization theory/management science garners scant support in political science. It would seem, therefore that public administration should, and perhaps must, find a new paradigm that encourages both a focus and a locus for the field.

Paradigm 5: Public Administration as Public Administration, 1970-?

The traditional and rigid distinction of the field between the "public sphere" and the "private sphere" appears to be waning as public administration's new and flexibly defined locus waxes. Furthermore, public administrationists have been increasingly concerned with the inextricably related areas of policy science, political economy, the public policy making process and its analysis, and the measurement of policy outputs. These aspects can be viewed, in some ways, as a linkage between public administration's evolving focus and locus. Since late 1980s some trends are visible in the field of public administration. These are: trend of globalization, redefinition of the role of government from directing & control-

ling towards partnership & collaboration, treating citizens as customers, focus on providing 'value for money', emphasis on outcomes rather than on rules & procedures and devolution of powers to the local governments and administration at lower levels. Today governance means collaborative partnership among the public, government, communities, market and the voluntary organizations. However, it should be appreciated that involving these partners in the process of governance puts more & not less responsibility on the shoulders of the public officials. Thus, the field of public administration has redefined itself towards increasing relevance and importance of the human welfare.

With a paradigmatic focus of organization theory and management science, and a paradigmatic locus of the public interest as it relates to public affairs, public administration at last is intellectually prepared for the building of an institutionally autonomous educational curriculum that can develop the epistemological uniqueness of the field. Fortunately, the institutional trend in public administration appears to be heading in the direction of establishing separate schools of public affairs and separate departments of public administration. The MPA and DPA degrees are gaining in student popularity, and those academic journals concerned with public policy, public affairs, and the public bureaucracy are flourishing and proliferating. A major sign of public administration's growing independence is the dramatic growth of institutes of government, public administration, and urban affairs, and various kinds of public policy centers in universities.

It is time for public administration to come into its own. Substantial progress has been in this direction intellectually. For perhaps the first time in public administration's history, a tentative paradigm has been formulated for the field that defines the discipline's "specialized what" and its "institutional where." This intellectual ripening must not be allowed to wither in institutional settings that are unsympathetic-perhaps antithetical- to public administration's new and vital paradigm. The uses of the field to society seems obvious, and, in an age in which higher education generally is suffering from declining enrollments, public administration programs are turning away highly qualified applicants. In short, the social, economic, intellectual, and political reasons for public administration to assert its identity and autonomy are there.

Thus, Nicholas Henry narrated very briefly the up and downs, confusion and uncertainty of the development of public administration until 1970s. Many scholars add sixth paradigm as Governance Era Paradigm, which begins especially after 1990's. Nowadays-public administration, become truly interdisciplinary in its nature. Simon's decision-making approach has extensively widened the scope of the subject by relating it to psychology, sociology, economics, and political science. F. W. Riggs through his contribution (Comparative Public Administration, Ecological Approach, and Development Administration) pointed out that it is necessary to have different kind of principles of administration depending on environment and culture. The New Public Administration movement traced to deal with contemporary problems and issues. Its urge for relevance, post-positivism, morals, ethics, and values innovation, concern for clients, social equity enhanced the horizons of public administration as a subject as well as practice and brought it close to society. Ostrom's Public Choice School developed the concept of 'democratic administration', which urge for diverse democratic decision-making structure (instead of traditional bureaucratic structure), popular participation in administration and dispersed administrative authority. A critical theory of public administration has started a movement towards improving the quality of organizational life by breaking the barriers of communication and encouraging participative & shared organizational existence. The recent phase of evolution of public administration coincides with a general concern in the social sciences for public policy analysis. As of now a coherent concentrated and organized body of knowledge on the phenomenon of public administration is still evolving. There is neither a common research tradition nor the necessary consensus for a common field of inquiry. Hence, as a subject of study, public administration is still in search of its identity and this exercise probably is a sign of health.

REFERENCES:

- I. Bhattacharya, Mohit, 1998, New Horizons of Public Administration, Jawahar Publishers & Distributors, New Delhi
- II. Arora, Ramesh K. (ed), 2004, Public Administration: Fresh Perspectives, Aalekh Publishers, Jaipur
- III. Nicholas, Henry, 2003, Public Administration and Public Affairs, 8th Ed., Prentice Hall Private Limited, New Delhi
- IV. Wilson, Woodrow, "The Study of Administration", Political Science Quarterly, Vol.2, June 1887
- V. Sharma, M.P., 2003, Public Administration in Theory and Practice, Kitab Mahal, Allahabad
- VI. Frederickson, Smith, Larimer, and Licari, 2012, The Public Administration Theory Primer, 2nd Ed., Westview Press, Boulder
- VII. "Towards Good Governance", Indian Journal of Public Administration, Vol. XLIV, No. 3
- VIII. Sahni Pardeep and Vayunandan Etakula, 2010, Administrative Theory, PHI Learning Private Limited, New Delhi
- IX. Ostrom, V. and Ostrom E., 1971, "Public Choice: A Different Approach to the Study of Public Administration", Public Administration Review, Vol.33

- X. Dhameja Alka (ed), 2003, Contemporary Debates in Public Administration, Prentice Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi
- XI. Bhattacharya , Mohit, 2006, Restructuring Public Administration, Jawahar Publishers & Distributors, New Delhi
- XII. Maheshwari, Shriram, 2003, Administrative Theory, 2nd Ed., Macmillan India Ltd, New Delhi
- XIII. Sapru, R. K., 2006, Administrative Theories and Management Thought, Prentice Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi
- XIV. Rowley and Schneider, The Encyclopedia of Public Choice, Vol. 01, Kluwer Academic Publisher, New York
- XV. Hooja Rakesh and Arora Ramesh, 2007, Administrative Theory, Rawat Publication, Jaipur